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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study focus
This paper focuses on a historical review of five small-scale community-based tourist enterprises in the Kunene/Erongo Regions - three community campsites and two traditional villages (see Figure 1 for their location and Appendices 1 to 3 for details of enterprises and research methods). Three out of the five case-study enterprises are owned and managed by conservancies (i.e. Okarohombo campsite owned by Marienflüss Conservancy; Ugab Wilderness campsite owned by Tsiseb Conservancy and the Himba Traditional Village owned by Purros Conservancy). The third case-study campsite has contested ownership and a local, private individual ‘owns’ Anmire Traditional Village with a community benefit-sharing agreement. The latter two enterprises fall within the Anabeb Conservancy. Trench et al. (2003) provide a detailed record of the proceedings of all five workshops.

The objectives of the workshops were to identify, analyse and document perceptions of local people responsible for the establishment of the enterprises. These perceptions relate to the key factors that had affected the adoption and impact of the enterprise and the tangible and intangible livelihood costs and benefits for these people, their families and the broader community. This report is part of a three-paper series, which compliments the tourism-values study (i.e. Roe et al. 2002) by providing qualitative data. Two earlier papers focused on community-owned tourism enterprises in the Caprivi Region and used very similar participatory workshop methods to obtain qualitative data pertaining on the establishment and functioning of the enterprises. One paper focused on the factors contributing to successful community-owned tourism enterprise as identified by the local people and support organisations responsible for enterprise establishment (Halstead 2003), and a second reviewed the institutional aspects of, and livelihood change brought by, the same Caprivian enterprises (Halstead and Murphy 2003). A recommendation from the Caprivi research was to broaden the scope of study to include other regions in Namibia in order to test the robustness of the research findings.

Comparison between community-owned enterprises in Caprivi and Kunene Regions
A comparison between the historical development of the case-study enterprises in the Kunene and Caprivi Regions revealed that the Kunene community enterprises are older than those in Caprivi and pre-date conservancy formation. They lack an institutional framework to clarify ownerships and benefits, which the conservancy programme has provided in Caprivi. This has meant that in some cases the community-based campsites in Kunene have contested ownership (e.g. Khowarib Restcamp, Purros Campsite¹, Ongongo Campsite and Para Camp).

The institutional players in the arena of community-based tourism enterprises in Caprivi and Kunene are very similar. The key figures are community-based organisations (CBOs), Traditional Authorities, Government bodies, the private sector, donor funders and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). As was the case in Caprivi, all five case-studies enterprises used external

¹ Purros Conservancy (represented by LAC in the High Court) won the court case over campsite ownership between the conservancy and a private individual.
funding to build the enterprise infrastructure and obtained support to do this through NGOs, with a private loan being used for the Anmire Traditional Village.

Livelihood-based change
Community tourism ventures in Kunene have diversified existing livelihoods by allowing a limited number of people to gain a local, cash income, as well as accessing training and career development. An estimated average annual income for campsite staff members was approximately N$ 4 000. This income is modest, but as a regular cash earning adds significantly to income security. Opportunities are few and it is no small achievement for local communities to develop and manage enterprises, which provide full-time, albeit limited employment, in remote areas.

Valuing natural resources in supporting tourism
Case-study evidence shows that the development of community-based tourism enterprises has fostered recognition by local people of the value of natural resources in supporting tourism. A strong awareness of tourism issues, especially an understanding of what tourists want to experience, is also developing.

Pride in valuing cultural tradition
Valuing cultural tradition was an aspect portrayed at both the traditional village case studies.

Some costs
Costs of the enterprise establishment documented by the workshops included giving up rights to land and resources at the tourist site and conflict over enterprise ownership.

The future
Due to a variety of reasons, many community-owned enterprises in Kunene (particularly those started by local people without successful outside or NGO assistance) are not of the quality required to attract tourists. These poorly managed enterprises do little for the image of community-based tourism in Namibia². The information from this report and the workshop proceedings document can assist in developing guidelines for current best practice for the industry.

² At the time of doing research to inform this paper, two of the five case-study enterprises (Anmire Traditional Village and Khowarib Restcamp) could be classified as being of poor quality, mainly due to management problems.
Figure 1: Sketch map of five case-study enterprises (not to scale)
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1. **Introduction**

**Rationale for research paper**
Community-based tourism (CBT) is well developed in Namibia. However, prior to the research carried out to inform this report and the others in this series, there had been no detailed, participatory review of existing CBT tourism enterprises with local people responsible for the enterprise establishment.

The earlier papers in this series presented similar research conducted in Caprivi. Halstead (2003) focused on the factors contributing to successful community-owned tourism enterprises, as identified by the local people and support organisations responsible for enterprise establishment. Halstead and Murphy (2003) concentrated on understanding the institutional aspects of the enterprises and how these institutions have shaped the impact of the enterprises on people’s livelihoods. One of the recommendations of the latter paper was that the scope of study should be broadened to include other regions in Namibia in order to test the robustness of research findings. Hence research was conducted to inform this report, focusing on detailed, participatory reviews, of five enterprises in Kunene. Over eighty-five people responsible for the development and management of these enterprises participated in the five different workshops.

The livelihood change brought about by CBT enterprises is detailed in Section 2. Section 3 addresses a comparison between the research findings in Caprivi and Kunene. The paper ends with conclusions of findings and recommendations to improve the practice of CBT enterprises from an institutional and livelihoods perspective.

**Sustainable Livelihood Approach**
The sustainable livelihoods approach facilitates an understanding of CBT enterprises beyond the direct financial benefits, to what the enterprises mean to local people and the contribution of CBT enterprises to the overall development and conservation context (Ashley 1999 and 2000; and Long 2002). This approach was adopted in the analysis of the research findings.

**Background to research case studies**

**Government legislation and the CBNRM programme**

---

3 Community-based tourism (CBT) relates to organised communities using their natural and cultural resources on a sustainable basis for tourism, in order to improve their livelihoods and resource management. Use can be through community ownership and management or contracted to the private sector.

4 This formed a component of the Wildlife Integration for Livelihood Diversification (WILD) Project, a three-year participatory, applied research project of the MET focusing on CBNRM and livelihoods.

5 Refer to Trench et al. 2003 for workshop proceedings.
Both a conceptual and legislative framework for the initiation of CBT was provided by the Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) programme (Roe et al. 2001 and NACSO 2002). The CBNRM philosophy is based on the principle that communities, through the protection and sustainable use of natural resources, will receive direct benefits. Since the 1990s, a number of CBT initiatives have opened and have experienced varying levels of success. Some of these developments have been highly successful, while others are in various stages of decay.6

**Case-studies enterprises in Kunene/Erongo Regions**

The five existing tourism enterprises in Kunene and Erongo Regions were chosen as the research case studies as they contrasted different approaches and institutional arrangements for management. Three of the five case studies (two campsites – Okarohombo and Ugab Wilderness) and one traditional village – Himba Traditional Village) are owned and managed by the communal-area conservancies. The community ownership of a tourist enterprise can be considered to be in place when a defined community:

- collectively has the legal rights to occupy the tourist site;
- collectively is the decision-making body for the enterprise in terms of management and has a structure for this in place (an example of this is a Conservancy Committee and Traditional Authority working together);
- benefits financially on a collective basis from profits made by the enterprise; and
- receives other benefits collectively, both tangible and intangible, from the enterprise.

Anmire Traditional Village is under private ownership with a verbal commitment to collective-benefit sharing7 and therefore is not strictly speaking community-owned according to the above definition. Khowarib Restcamp is a good example of a community tourism enterprise with contested ownership – community-ownership is one of the two contesting arrangements, the other being more individual benefit to the person who initiated the enterprise on behalf of the community. Both Anmire Traditional Village and Khowarib Restcamp fall within the new Anabeb Conservancy. Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC) is the field-based NGO providing the most support in Kunene and RISE (Rural People’s Institute for Social Empowerment) in the Erongo Region.

### 2. **Institutional Players in CBT**8

Institutions participating in the facilitation, development and support of CBT enterprises in Namibia include community-based organisations (CBOs), the Traditional Authorities, government bodies such as the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and its various directorates, the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement and Rehabilitation (MLRR), the private sector and numerous non-governmental organisations (NGOs). These organisations are briefly referenced below in the

---

6 The Directorate of Tourism, NACOBTA and other NGOs are currently addressing some of these challenges and issues, through tourism planning, policy review, the development of guidelines for CBT and concessions and the establishment of the Namibia Tourism Board.

7 At the time of conducting this research, this enterprise was not functioning.

8 Refer to Halstead and Murphy (2003) for a more detailed analysis on the institutional players.
context of their broader role within CBT development and the establishment of community-owned tourism enterprises.

Community-based organisations (CBOs)
The organisational vehicle that drives community-based tourism enterprises are CBOs. Unlike in Caprivi, where elected Conservancy Committees provided a legal, support structure for the establishment and management of CBT enterprises, some CBT enterprises in Kunene were established prior to the inauguration of conservancies and lacked the benefit of the conservancy structures to clarify collective ownership and benefit. Regardless of the timing, the capacity for committees to manage enterprises is being questioned and other management options advocated, e.g. outsourcing management to a private company or individual on a lease basis. Refer to Halstead and Murphy (2003) for a summary of various management options for community-owned tourism enterprises as identified by support organisations.

Traditional Authorities
In areas where there is strong support and leadership by the Traditional Authority (TA), community-owned tourism enterprise have a greater chance of success (Halstead 2003). The working relationship between Conservancy Committees and TA needs to be strong to avoid conflict. The Conservancy Committee has rights over wildlife, while TAs have a long history of land allocation and management, with the Traditional Authorities Act stating that the TA must ensure sustainable use of renewable natural resources within their area of jurisdiction (Jones 2002).

In the case of the Khowarib Restcamp, it is interesting to note that the Traditional Authorities gave early approval for the campsite to go ahead, called in the Regional Governor to assist with ownership disputes and have now “picked up the pieces” at the end of a long-standing conflict over contested ownership (Box 1).

**Box 1: Role of Traditional Authorities in the long-standing ownership dispute at Khowarib Restcamp**
(extract from history timeline of Khowarib Restcamp, WILD Working Paper No. 26: 54/55)

“This is a very interesting and good meeting. We [speaking as a member of the Traditional Authorities] were brought in to clean up the mess... the campsite was very dirty. We also noticed the number of visitors was low. Two workers also stepped down because they had no salary money. Honestly speaking there is no money because visitors are not coming to the camp. During 2002, the SRT released funds, so we held several meetings with SRT and the Traditional Authorities, and we appointed some workers and building started – two flush toilets and two showers. We also built some Himba huts over there. At the start we employed 32 workers. In the plan we were to build some bungalows. They were not built, because money was overspent. Money came from Blythe (SRT) for building materials. The building materials are not here, although some of them were here [have disappeared]. The builder also claimed some money for his weekend trips to Khorixas. The actual money used for the construction of the campsite was high. If we look at what is here, the value is not correct... The EU stopped funding because there was some misuse of funds...”

Government Ministries

*Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)*
The Directorate of Tourism (DoT) is in place to ensure adherence to tourism legislation, regulations and policies. The newly-established Namibian Tourism Board (NTB) is responsible for the marketing of Namibia’s tourism industry and the setting of standards. Due to DOT’s lack of regional presence, and the NTB having not yet included community-based tourism enterprises in their standard setting or marketing, they have had little to no input in CBT development in Kunene.
Ministry of Lands and Resettlement and Rehabilitation (MLRR)
The MLRR is responsible for land-use planning and administers communal land on behalf of the state (Roe et al. 2001). The MLRR is a key Ministry in the context of CBT enterprises as it issues the PTOs for tourism development on communal land.

Private Sector
Although this sector does not often play a major role in the development of community-owned tourism enterprise, in some cases finance and ongoing support such as training and marketing has been provided by the private sector, e.g. by Camp Synchro at the Okarohombo Campsite. Private sector involvement in CBT is stronger in the lodge industry through joint-venture agreements with conservancies.

Donors
Historically, the main donor support for conservancy development in Kunene has come from WWF (International and UK) and the German Government (M. Jacobsohn, pers. comm.). This support has been channelled through NGOs, predominately IRDNC.

Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs)
There has been strong, active promotion and support from various NGOs for community-based tourism in rural conservancies. Apart from IRDNC and RISE who have an office and field staff in Kunene and Erongo Regions respectively, all other NGOs offering support to CBT are Windhoek based.

Rural-peoples’ Institute for Social Empowerment in Namibia (RISE)
RISE started in 1987. As an organisation it sees itself as a catalyst within a very dynamic process of development, in which the rural family-household and/or the rural communities, as the primary actors, aim to improve their living standards through their own efforts. RISE aims to facilitate the emergence of new community-based institutions and/or strengthening of existing grass-roots-based organisations, through which the poor can promote their socio-economic development (RISE Constitution).

Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC)
As Namibia’s largest, field-based, CBNRM support NGO, IRDNC’s participation in the CBNRM programme and related tourism started in 1982 with the initiation of the Community Game Guard (CGG) programme in the Kunene (Jones 2001). IRDNC’s work within the Namibian CBNRM programme recognises the need for communities to benefit through tourism. IRDNC staff has been instrumental in the establishment and ongoing support of various community tourism enterprises in Kunene, especially community-owned tourism enterprises. The provision of transport by IRDNC was a significant factor assisting in the establishment of some of the case-study enterprises (Himba Traditional Village, Okarohombo Campsite and Anmire Traditional Village).

Namibian Community-based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)
NACOBTA was started in 1995 as a non-profit membership organisation that supports communities in their efforts to develop tourism enterprises in Namibia. Services to members, include, training in

9 Refer to Roe et al. 2001, Vol. 1, Case study 5 for more details on this private sector-community partnership.
tourism, business advice, funding, marketing (through a booking office in the Namibian Craft Centre and a web page) and advocacy. NACOBTA’s limited resources and the distance and logistics of working with communities in Kunene have limited the amount of support NACOBTA can provide. NACOBTA’s training support was mentioned as a factor helping in the establishment of Khowarib Restcamp and Okarohombo Campsite.

**Rössing Foundation (RF)**
The RF provides training aimed at the management of the conservancy programme such as benefit distribution planning and joint-venture negotiations between private tourism operators and communities. The RF has been the lead NGO in the community-based craft development component of the Namibian CBNRM programme and they work with other NGOs (including IRDNC) to implement the programme. RF’s support to craft includes technical training on design, quality and marketing. They also provide a sales outlet through Mud Hut Trading, which purchases crafts from communities and sells them through international and local outlets.

**Legal Assistance Centre (LAC)**
The LAC is a human rights organisation that provides free legal advice and advocacy to minorities and disadvantaged communities. LAC has supported CBT through assisting with drafting constitutions for individual enterprises and CBOs and tourism contracts, as well as providing general legal assistance for CBT when required. LAC staff members have been dealing with the legal aspects of the contested campsites in Kunene, including the Khowarib Restcamp.

**Namibian Nature Foundation (NNF)**
NNF provides financial administration assistance to registered conservancies that receive NACSO grants for operational expenses, as well as help in fund-raising, monitoring and evaluation.

**Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NACSO)**
NACSO provides networking, advocacy, information and publicity services to the CBNRM programme. It is the co-ordinating body for the support organisations and plays a lead role in the strategic development of CBNRM. The association has four main objectives:
- to ensure CBOs have the capacity to manage;
- to promote sustainable integrated resource use and management;
- to ensure that CBO and community income and benefits are increased; and
- to ensure that the capacity of CBNRM support organisations is increased.

NACSO has a Business and Enterprise Working Group, chaired by NACOBTA, that is currently looking at best practice guidelines for CBT.

---

10 Refer to Suich and Murphy 2002 and Murphy and Suich 2003 for information on the livelihood impact of craft sales in Caprivi.

11 Some craft was sold from the Marienflüss Conservancy to Mud Hut with the help of the owner of the lodge, Camp Synchro. However, when interviewed at the time of the case-study workshop, he said that he prefers to sell direct his identified markets as he can get higher prices for the producers.
3. LIVELIHOOD CHANGE BROUGHT BY CASE-STUDY ENTERPRISES

This section reviews the collective and individual-level change as a result of enterprise establishment. Individual-level change focuses on the enterprise staff or producers, while collective change refers to change felt by people more broadly across the community. Changes have been categorised as either financial or non-financial benefits and costs. Table 1 provides a summary of these changes.

Table 1: Summary of collective and individual level livelihood change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change felt at collective level</th>
<th>Change felt at individual level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL BENEFITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collective income available for distribution</td>
<td>• Collective income distributed at individual level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(distributed on a ‘needs basis’ at Himba Traditional Village (Purros Conservancy) and Okarohombo campsite, (Marienflüss Conservancy))</td>
<td>• Cash wage from employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Power shifts to increase group’s control of income</td>
<td>• Income from tour guiding and craft sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-FINANCIAL BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>NON-FINANCIAL BENEFITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pride in valuing cultural resources</td>
<td>• Training opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Valuing natural resources for use in tourism</td>
<td>• Career path development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heightened awareness of tourism issues</td>
<td>• Compensation for not using campsite to meet livelihood needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor product leading to poor image of community-owned enterprises</td>
<td><strong>COSTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>COSTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Giving up rights to land and resources</td>
<td>• Land-use change felt at an individual level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict over ownership</td>
<td>• Conflict expressed at an individual level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor quality enterprises leading to a reduction in jobs and cash</td>
<td>• Poor quality enterprises lead to a reduction in jobs and cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential for distribution</td>
<td>potential for distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Benefits

The NACOBTA database was used to look at the financial viability of the case-study enterprises in 2002\(^\text{12}\). From standard income and expenditure figures, the four case-study enterprises (Anmire Traditional Village, Himba Traditional Village, Okarohombo Campsite and Khowarib Restcamp) could cover expenses and make a profit. Refer to Table 2.

Table 2: Financial data for four of the case-study enterprises, 2002 (from NACOBTA database)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>No. of visitors</th>
<th>Income NS</th>
<th>Expenditure NS</th>
<th>Profit NS</th>
<th>Staff numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khowarib</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>21,954</td>
<td>15,340</td>
<td>6,614</td>
<td>7 to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okarohombo</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>50,605</td>
<td>16,305</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anmire Trad. Village</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1 (April to Sept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himba Trad. Village</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>7 (Jan to Sept)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most profitable enterprise was Okarohombo Campsite with a profit of N$ 34,500. (Roe et al. (2001) reported that a turn over of N$ 30,000 was made in 1999 by the Okarohombo Campsite). Although it received a similar number of visitors to Okarohombo Campsite (about 1,600 visitors),

\(^{12}\) No data was available for the Ugab Wilderness Campsite and only data from 2002 for the other case-study enterprises.
the Khowarib Restcamp made about a sixth of the profit of Okarohombo Campsite due to a much larger salary overhead (7 to 9 full-time staff compared to 2 staff at Okarohombo). Anmire Traditional Village was barely functioning with an income of N$ 808, expenditure of N$ 360 and profit of N$ 440.

Income and expenditure information took the form of wages, camping fees and craft sales. Participants from all five workshops mentioned financial benefits derived from the enterprises for individuals and the community. Information below provides the detail of these financial benefits.

Money from campsite fees was named as a benefit in the Khowarib Restcamp workshop. Some income also came from crafts sold at the reception: “Things that people make they put at reception for tourists to buy”. With regard to use of revenues, workshop participants recorded that people came to borrow money on loan, for example if they were sick and that funds were also used to help very poor members of the community to buy coffins for funerals. Campsite revenues were also used to fund accommodation, travel and food for community people attending meetings in Windhoek. With regard to Anmire Traditional Village, there was a verbal agreement of benefit sharing once profit was made, but the initiative seemed to have collapsed before this was done. Salaries to construction workers and campsite staff were mentioned as financial benefits accruing from the Ugab Wilderness Camp. The role play of the benefits of this campsite showed a couple enjoying a better quality of life from wages earned at the campsite.

The Himba Traditional Village started out as a craft market in Purros Village in the early nineties, evolved into a traditional village in 1998 when it moved to a first site outside Purros, and to its present site in 1999. IRDNC assisted with paying staff salaries for two years (2000 - 2001), but now the village is self-funding. The entrance fees (N$ 20 per person) from the Himba Traditional Village in Purros are banked in the conservancy account and used to pay the salaries of staff working in the village (seven women). One plan for the use of conservancy funds is to build a clinic in Purros (at present people have to travel to Sesfontein about a four-hour drive away on poor roads). Craft is sold at the Traditional Village with a 10% commission paid to Purros Conservancy. Four of the workshop participants made craft to sell in the village – Himba leather dolls, traditional Himba palm baskets made from palm harvested in the Hoarusib River and traditional wooden buckets. There are a small number of producers who sell their craft, but they can make enough money to buy livestock and food, and pay school and clinic fees (Bertha Tjibombo, pers. comm.). Apparently, conservancy members can also use funds from the gate fees when needed (E. Thaniseb, pers. comm.).

A local lodge owner initiated the Okarohombo Campsite in 1991 in an independent effort to reduce the degradation caused by campers using the site informally. In 1996, an initiative started to hand over management of the campsite to the community. In 2000, the newly gazetted Marienflüss Conservancy took over full ownership and management of the campsite. During all or some of the period in between, an arrangement was made by the lodge owner with NNF to manage the campsite fees and pay the community a 20% commission. Three amounts of N$ 3,000 were paid during the period. Apparently money were used to fund celebrations. Loans were also provided to local people

---

13 This is probably due to the poor professional performance of the individual owner/manager.
14 Although not recorded in the workshop, Roe et al. (2001) reported that this initiative occurred “as a result of payments and increased awareness within the conservancy that there was money to be earned from tourism”.

12
but seldom paid back. Funds are now used on a needs basis. When asked whether the campsite is a success or a failure, an elderly woman at the workshop replied, “It is a success as last year when I was sick, I got N$ 300 to pay for the trip to go to the hospital in Opuwo.” Other workshop participants reported that the campsite is a success “because all the people from the community can get money and this helps the community in many different cases” and “this is the first time that the community has generated funds on their own. Before we got money from the IRDNC” (responses from workshop participants, Okarohombo Campsite workshop, 25 February 2003).

**Financial Costs**

As external donor funding or private-sector funding was used to develop the enterprises, no direct financial costs were borne by the local communities. A private individual took out a loan from IRDNC to develop the Anmire Village.

**Non-financial benefits**

*Pride in valuing cultural tradition*

Unsurprisingly, in the role play method used to show the benefits of the enterprises, the advantage of valuing cultural traditions was portrayed at the two traditional villages case studies. Both role plays consisted of workshop participants singing and dancing (Box 2).

**Box 2: Pride in people valuing cultural tradition as a benefit of tourism in communal areas**

The role play staged by workshop participants to show the benefits of the development of the Anmire Traditional Village in Khowarib, Kunene, was a demonstration of “one of the traditional Damara dances that are done at ceremonies – weddings, any event with the community. We are proud of it. We established a traditional village that teaches new generations about our culture, so that our culture does not get lost” (Ephraim Taniseb, Anmire Traditional Village workshop, 5 March 2003). At the Himba Traditional Village in Purros, the role play was “our traditional dance. We use it on different occasions – when some one is married we do the same dancing, for circumcision and in celebration when we remember our ancestors/heroes. This is the dancing they do in the Himba Village to show tourists and tourists can take photographs. It reminds us about our culture, so we do not forget our culture” (Jackson Kasupi, Himba Traditional Village workshop, 25 February 2003).

*Valuing natural resources for their use in tourism*

Another benefit from the development of the case-study enterprises has been the recognition and understanding by local people of the value of natural resources in supporting tourism (Box 3).

**Box 3: Valuing natural resources for their use in tourism**

The presence of elephants attracting tourists to Purros was seen as an advantage for the Himba Traditional Village – “one good thing about the traditional village is that it is very attractive for tourists. When they are looking for the elephant, they can visit the village as well (participant, Himba Village workshop, 25 February 2003). Traditional plants and medicines were used in demonstration at the Anmire Traditional Village.

Khowarib Restcamp lies on a plateau above Hoanib River, with spectacular views of the perennial streams and cliffs upriver. When asked why the site had been chosen for a campsite, a workshop participant replied, “Tourists came here already looking for accommodation. They liked the views, the river and the trees” (workshop participant, Khowarib workshop, 3 March 2003). The Brandberg Mountain, White Lady Painting, elephants and a new insect species were named by workshop participants as features that helped the enterprise establishment (Ugab Wilderness Camp workshop, 17 March 2003).
**Heightened awareness of tourism issues**

Heightened awareness of tourism issues by workshop participants was shown through an understanding of what tourists want to experience. Members of the Tsiseb Conservancy saw a chance for expanding income opportunities, when they identified “no campsite vehicle to take game drives to visit elephants” as a hindrance to the development of the campsite (Ugab Wilderness Campsite workshop, 17 March 2003). At the Himba Traditional Village, workshop participants described their shift in marketing from the unsatisfactory arrangement of people “chasing cars” with their craft, to selling craft in one place, then expanding from a craft market to a traditional village. They also mentioned a number of measures they had taken recently to make the village more attractive to tourists and mentioned the need for a pamphlet to improve marketing.

**Power shifts to increase the group’s control and its income**

There was evidence from three of the case studies of power shifting from individuals to the community over control of the enterprises. At the Okarohombo Campsite workshop, participants described how the Marienflüss community approached the local lodge owner in 1996 to take over control of the campsite. After the Marienflüss Conservancy was established in November 2000, the Conservancy Committee and Campsite Committee took over decision-making and assisted the campsite manager with management and handling money. The Khowarib Community maintained the rights to ownership of the campsite over the years in which this was contested by the local individual who started the campsite with financial assistance from SRT. The Himba Traditional Village described changes after the conservancy was gazetted including improving attractiveness to tourists (an entrance stone, shelter built for craft, rules on traditional dress only for staff) and discussions with the local lodge owner for a better deal – “Mr Schoeman brings visitors to the area, for which he pays N$ 20 per tourist [works as a bed-night levy]. He brings visitors to the traditional village but does not pay the entrance fee. There is a feeling that he should pay more to use the facilities in the area and encourage tourists to spend more on buying things in the village (workshop participants, Himba Traditional Village workshop, 25 February 2003).

**Other benefits**

Other intangible benefits identified included training opportunities, career path development (one staff member from the Anmire Traditional Village is working for the Fort Sesfontein Lodge), skills acquisition, increased knowledge and confidence, and compensation for no longer being able to use the tourist site.

Workshop participants at three case-study enterprises (Okarohombo Campsite, Khowarib Restcamp and Ugab Wilderness Campsite) mentioned various types training from NACOBTA as a factor that helped the establishment of the enterprise. This training included financial management, tour guiding and tourism awareness. The campsite manager from Okarohombo Campsite described training from NACOBTA in “how to communicate with tourists and give them what they want”. In the context of support for this enterprise, an outside tourism consultant at the workshop commented that “the campsite initiative could have flourished more if it had had more support… being at the end of the Marienflüss valley and the greatest destination campsite in Namibia… outside support could have been stronger, e.g. in assisting with the transfer of skills, and tourism awareness... There could be more activities, greater effort to make the campsite more comfortable...” The lodge owner commented that “a stumbling block in the last couple of years is a too-heavy reliance on NGO support. These NGOs are not located in the Marienflüss and are not business or tourist specialists...” (Okarohombo Campsite workshop, 25 February, 2003).
Non-financial costs with establishment of enterprises

Giving up rights to land and resources
Giving up access to resources from the site used by the enterprises was a trade-off made by local people that was mentioned at three of the case studies. Prior to the development of the Okarohombo Campsite, the area was used for grazing (pods used from the Ana trees that provide shade in the campsite) and some people had gardens/fields along the river where some of the campsites are located. The site for the Anmire Traditional Village was also used for grazing by cattle, sheep, goats and donkeys. Likewise local farmers in the Tsiseb Conservancy gave up grazing land with Ana trees along the Ugab River for the establishment of the Ugab Wilderness camp (Box 4). One workshop participant said that a reason for the success of the Ugab Wilderness campsite was that birds and elephants are coming back to that area, a result of the new land use of the area as a tourist site. A successful process of consultation preceded the change (Box 4).

Box 4: Farmers giving up access to land for the Ugab Wilderness Camp, Tsiseb Conservancy
“During setting up of the campsite, livestock were grazing here. The Traditional Authorities let the farmers know about the use of the area for tourists. They are not excluded from the area but have a voluntary agreement to keep their livestock out of the camp” (Engelhardine Tauros, representing the Traditional Authorities at the Ugab Wilderness campsite workshop, 17 March, 2003). “There was a conflict between the farmers and the conservancy as the campsite is located on good grazing land and the farmers wanted to know what would happen to their livestock... Some of the farmers got temporary jobs during construction and permanent jobs in the camp (some are still here now). The farmers are now seeing the benefits.” (Eric Xaweb, Tsiseb Conservancy Manager, at the Ugab Wilderness Campsite workshop, 17 March 2003).

Conflict over ownership
The Khowarib Restcamp workshop proved to be a valuable learning experience in the context of the ‘contested’ campsites in Kunene, many if not all were established prior to conservancy formation (Box 5). Several outside organisations were involved in its development. Its ownership and status have been hotly contested and the management has changed several times. At the time of the workshop, the campsite was just functional. Half-completed and poorly designed infrastructure reflects the shifts in its management and outside interventions. The LAC has taken on the case in order to provide a legal solution. The workshop was remarkable for the open participation by the two contesting parties.

Box 5: Conflict over ownership of the Khowarib Restcamp
Elau Ganuseb, the person who started the camp said, “The campsite of Khowarib has a long-running conflict. Because of this long-running conflict, the development is not so good... The workshop [research workshop] won’t resolve the conflict but we can name the conflict which might help in the future.” (Khowarib Restcamp workshop, 3 March 2003). The time line exercise yielded a long description of the turbulent history of the campsite from 1990 to December 2002 and the dysfunctional structures. “People are hired and dismissed, the committee is elected and dismissed. There are no structures in place at the moment.” A member of the traditional authorities concluded the historical narrative by staying, “We [the Traditional Authorities] were brought in to clean up the mess. All what was given we cleaned up – the campsite was very dirty. We also noticed that the level of visitors was very low...”

An interesting comparison with regard to ownership is the Anmire Traditional Village, which is located in the same community. Although started by a local individual, there is no contest over ownership. This is likely a result of the clarity over individual ownership established early on, together with the private loan taken out by the owner to start the enterprise. In the context of the Khowarib Restcamp, there was no clarity over ownership, funds were obtained for the venture as a
community enterprise and the PTO states that the individual mentioned is holding the PTO on behalf of the community.

The Ugab Wilderness Camp also has a history of conflict over its ownership, now hopefully resolved by the formation of the Tsiseb Conservancy and agreements about how the campsite will operate.

4. Case-study experience of enterprise management

Three of the five case-study enterprises were struggling with management issues that had reduced their performance. This is not surprising as communal management of tourism enterprises (both the actual management and the support to management) has been identified as a complex and time-consuming option (Ashley 1995 and Halstead 2003). Sound management structures and processes for transparency need to be in place. Due to the number of people in communities and the demanding nature of the tourism industry, successful communal management is almost always difficult to achieve\textsuperscript{15}. However, in the context of CBNRM, proponents claim that a comparative advantage of some type of community ownership of tourism, over jobs for local individuals in private lodges, is that it enhances the link between conservation and development opportunities and in so doing (hopefully) improves natural resource management\textsuperscript{16}.

Despite the management problems at the three enterprises, workshop participants were still positive when asked whether the enterprises were a success or not, as they felt they the enterprises had been a success or were moving towards being a success\textsuperscript{17}. The Anmire Traditional Village was not functioning as a result of poor management. However, at the end of the workshop, one participant reflected that “the whole purpose of the establishment of the village was to take things forward, it was slowly moving towards success. We never want our traditions to die out, we want to remember our traditions”. Another participant said, “I agree with the previous speaker but the ways of the current management need to change. Options are getting cooperation from the community or asking other institutions to pick up the management of the site. Economic resources are needed” (Anmire Traditional Village workshop, 5 March 2003).

Likewise, a final comment by one workshop participant at the Khowarib Restcamp workshop was, “Here are two tribes at Khowarib and I think the conflict will not end because of this. If someone from outside can come – a private investor – we could resolve this process.” In reply to this, a representative of the Traditional Authorities said, “If we held a meeting, I think the community would accept that. We heard about jealousy – it is not true. The problem was that there were decisions in meetings but no work was carried on afterwards. Let’s meet after the meeting and

\textsuperscript{15} As a result, NACOBTA are currently supporting the idea of a management change for poorly run community-owned and managed campsites that has the potential to improve the quality of these enterprises.

\textsuperscript{16} Other arguments in favour of community ownership of tourism is that the land and resources are communally owned as common-property resources and ownership enhances empowerment by giving back some measure of control over resources to local people.

\textsuperscript{17} This question was not asked at the Khowarib Restcamp workshop due to the large numbers of people, heated debate and wish by workshop facilitators to end the workshop on a positive note.
appoint two guys who can look for private investors”18 (Khowarib Restcamp workshop, 3 March 2003).

At the Ugab Wilderness Campsite, a final comment from one participant was that the campsite had been a success “because the birds and elephants are coming back to the area. The farmers can see that the tourism is making money and no longer doubt this change in land use from grazing to the campsite” (Ugab Wilderness Campsite, 17 March 200319).

As the information above shows, a solution mentioned at the workshops to enterprise management difficulties was to outsource management. In this context, the management of community-owned enterprises in Namibia is currently under debate. Some of the support organisations feel that management by a committee may not be the best management option to maximise benefits and provide long-term sustainability for the enterprises. Various management options and scenarios have been identified and passed on to communities for their assessment (refer to Appendix 4). Monitoring and evaluation of these different management options will provide proof of their success or failure.

5. COMPARISON WITH COMMUNITY-OWNED ENTERPRISES IN CAPRIVI

There are more community-owned tourism enterprises in Kunene than in Caprivi. Although the total population figures are similar, the Kunene Region is much larger. Kunene community-owned tourism enterprises are older than those in Caprivi and pre-date conservancy formation. Lacking an institutional framework to clarify ownership and benefits, as provided by the conservancy programme in Caprivi, has meant that some community-owned campsites in Kunene have contested ownership (e.g. Khowarib Campsite, Purros campsite, Ongongo campsite). Where there has been clarification of ownership by the conservancies in Kunene, ownership conflicts have not developed e.g. at Okarohombo Campsite and Himba Traditional Village.

A comparison of data from the qualitative research in Caprivi and Kunene revealed that key success factors for community-owned tourism enterprises were very similar (refer to Table 3 for a summary of the main factors and Halstead 2003 for more detail on key success factors in Caprivi). In both regions, the limited tenure rights of the conservancy over the tourist sites (through PTOs and having ‘rights of exclusion’ to force tourists to use the designated sites for a fee, i.e. eliminate free riders) is an issue that needs to be addressed urgently.

18 It is worth noting that without solving the existing conflict, outsourcing campsite management will not necessary work.
19 Ugab Wilderness Campsite has been outsourced to a private individual (LIFE Semi-Annual Report, Oct 2002).
Table 3: Key success factors for community-owned tourism enterprises (adapted from Halstead 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Link made between natural resources and tourism benefits</td>
<td>* Community consultation &amp; agreement</td>
<td>* Access funds for start up</td>
<td>* Business skills</td>
<td>* Political stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Clarity on ownership</td>
<td>* Quick return of benefits</td>
<td>* Business support from outside</td>
<td>* Tribal stability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Land-use conflicts solved</td>
<td>* Financial transparency</td>
<td>* Appropriate management options</td>
<td>* Government – enabling legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Trust between all parties</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Training and experiential learning through study tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional players
The institutional players in the arena of community tourism enterprises in Caprivi and Kunene are very similar. The key actors are community-based organisations (CBOs), Traditional Authorities, government bodies, the private sector, donor funders and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The half-completed and poorly designed infrastructure at the Khowarib Restcamp reflects the lack of co-ordination among outside support agents.

Use of external funding for capital and start-up costs
Assistance with funding the development of the community-owned tourism enterprises was required in both Caprivi and Kunene. All case-studies enterprises used external funding to build the enterprise infrastructure and obtained support to do this through NGOs. In nearly all cases, the funding was a non-repayable grant – with a private loan at Anmire Traditional Village being the only exception. Assistance is also provided for operational costs until the enterprise becomes financially sustainable.

Change in land use at the tourist site
In both Kunene and Caprivi, a change in land usage and tenure on the tourist site required close attention, with special emphasis on the effected households. In both regions, effected individuals were given jobs in the new enterprises as part of resolving this land-use change.

Time-consuming nature of community-owned tourism enterprises
The Caprivi case studies recorded a very significant time cost to community members in the consultation process prior to the enterprise establishment and as a result of the collective management of the enterprise. This was not the case in Kunene and is probably related to rural Caprivians’ occupation of cropping as a main livelihood activity.

Need to explore alternative collective income-generation activities
Community-owned tourism enterprises are risky and provide low returns compared to joint-venture agreements or hunting concessions with private-enterprise partners. In both regions, there is a need to diversify conservancy income-generating activities to spread the risk and increase income.

Need for outside support especially in transporting building materials, tourism awareness, marketing and business management
Case studies for both areas illustrated the need for outside support both at a logistical and planning level. This includes a strong training component (both formal training and on-the-job training).
6. CONCLUSIONS

Box 6 summarises the livelihood implications from the case-study enterprises.

**Box 6: Livelihood implications from case-study enterprises**

**Reasons to be hopeful**
- Small-scale community-owned tourism enterprises are having some success, including campsites, traditional villages and craft markets.
- There is evidence that collective tourism revenues are being spent on development-related needs and contributing to livelihood security.
- Early signs of improved natural resource management and more positive attitudes to wildlife and tourism as a result of tourism benefits.
- Local-level institutional strengthening and capacity building, especially with the newly gazetted conservancies in Kunene.
- Attention being paid to better management options for community-owned tourism enterprises.

**Reasons to be cautious**
- Tourism is a risky business – communal income from small-scale community-owned tourism enterprises tourism is limited in most cases.
- More government leadership is needed for marketing and securing community tenures rights for tourism.
- Lack of secure tenure rights for communities creates uncertainty in the negotiation process between communities and private enterprise, which increases the risks and reduces the returns\(^{20}\).
- Lack of confidence of private sector in investing in communal areas, partly because of perceptions of varying quality of community-owned enterprises and high entry and maintenance costs.

Enterprise sustainability is affected by economic, social and environmental aspects.

**Economic and business issues**

All case-study enterprises, which were part of this study, needed to source external funding to fund the capital cost of the enterprise and start-up salaries for staff until the enterprise could be self-funding. This task was completed with the support of NGOs. Most funding took the form of a non-repayable grant. This is advantageous as capital costs do not need to be repaid and enterprises shortcut the time needed to cover operating costs to make the campsite staff members’ jobs sustainable or generate profit for benefit distribution – both of which are positive livelihood outcomes for local people.

Workshop participants did not display a strong understanding of the importance of business planning, training and marketing as a factor leading to successful enterprise development. This may be attributed to the inexperience, limited exposure and lack of understanding of tourism and business management that many rural communities experience. There is a need for improved business training with communities and for business plans to be conducted in the early stage of enterprise establishment to incorporate issues of financial viability, marketing and benefit distribution. Financial transparency must be maintained and benefits seen quickly to enhance the

\(^{20}\) The conservancies legal status partly offsets this problem.
trust and ‘buy in’ of community members. All enterprises showed a profit and some of the money had also been distributed to conservancy members. The three enterprises struggling with management problems could benefit from a change in management option, e.g. outsourcing management to a professional or a professional contract with a local entrepreneur. The disadvantage of this is a reduced sense of ownership and empowerment.

Joint-venture agreements with free enterprise partners have the potential to generate more and quicker benefits than community-owned and managed enterprises. A related cost here may be a reduced sense of ownership by the community – one of the key factors for successful natural resource management²¹.

Social issues
In Kunene, there are a significant number of contested campsites that were established pre-conservancy and without clear leadership and ownership/benefit agreements. In Caprivi, the community-owned campsites were all developed post-conservancy and there was no confusion over ownership. Conflicts are especially evident with regard to land issues that require parties to give up or change land usage. Strong local governance can ensure effective community consultation and agreement over the enterprise as well as solving any land-use conflicts over the tourist site. All the campsite case studies had to negotiate with community members to give up land to make it accessible for the tourist development. The initial resistance by affected parties was dealt with through broad consultation, strong traditional leadership, and at a later stage, through benefits such as employment, alternative land and assistance to move.

Environmental issues
A key environmental success factor for community-owned enterprises is enabling tourism to be seen as an incentive to conserve natural resources. The workshops used participatory research methods to generate qualitative information that is direct evidence of the awareness as to the importance of natural resources for tourism. In Caprivi, this was taken a bit further with qualitative evidence of a change in people’s attitudes, perceptions and values, leading to improved natural resource management, as a result of seeing the benefits of tourism. In addition, Torra Conservancy members benefiting from the January 2003 payout of N$ 630 reported that being recipients of the cash had made them more positive towards tourism and wildlife (Mulonga 2003). This evidence is very positive for the Namibian CBNRM programme, one of whose founding premises is that resource management will improve if people benefit from resources through financial incentives and proprietorship.

Strong government leadership and supportive policy and legislative framework
Government policy has been developed to support CBT in Namibia²². However, in most regions in Namibia, Government has had little capacity to support the implementation of policy²³. In addition, enabling legislation has been slow in coming. Rural conservancies do not have exclusive control over tourism in communal areas. Instead they have limited rights over the consumptive and non-

²¹ Handled correctly (e.g. good communication between free enterprise partner and conservancy and the establishment of a Joint Management Board), this need not be a significant problem.
²³ Most implementation has been carried out by NGOs.
consumptive wildlife and the *de jure* land rights remain in the hands of Central Government\(^{24}\). This has created uncertainty in the negotiation process between communities and private enterprise, which increases the risks and reduces the returns. Furthermore, the inability to exclude ‘free-riders’ reduces the communities’ incentives for implementing and enforcing zonation plans necessary for tourism.

The lack of clarity on the criteria and process for securing land (through the Permission To Occupy (PTO) system) for tourism developments within conservancy areas has a negative impact by reducing the communities’ legal tenure on tourism sites, jeopardising the positive livelihood benefits that can flow from community tourism\(^{25}\). What is required is greater devolution of tourism rights and responsibilities to conservancies linked to rights of exclusion. An appropriate National Tourism Concession Framework would be the vehicle to devolve these rights and assist in the long-term financial viability of conservancies.

---

\(^{24}\) The new Communal Land Boards have the power to grant rights of leasehold to any portion of communal land as long as the Traditional Authority consents to the right of leasehold.

\(^{25}\) The existing PTO system has been superseded by the creation of Communal Land Boards in the Regions. Provision has been made for a conservancy representative on each Regional Communal Land Board (LAC and NNFU 2003).
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APPENDIX 1: BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE FIVE CBT CASE STUDIES

The five case studies were a mix of more successful and less successful enterprises. Four of them are in the Kunene Region of Namibia and one in the Erongo Region (refer to Figure 1).

The Himba Traditional Village in Purros Conservancy lies a few km from the settlement of Purros, on an isolated and beautiful site at the foot of a range of hills near the Hoariseb River. Tourists visit the area to see desert elephant and giraffe, as well as the varied landscape. The Traditional Village was started as an initiative of people at Purros after they saw the benefits of centralising craft sales. Herero and Himba people use Purros as a dry-season base, both of whom speak Otjiherero.

Okarohombo Campsite in Marienflüss Conservancy lies on the Kunene River on the Angolan border, in the remote north-west of Namibia. The great attractions of the area are the Himba people, still living as semi-nomadic pastoralists, and the varied semi-desert landscapes. The campsite is only accessible to four-by-four vehicles. The campsite was started as the initiative of a local lodge owner who later handed it over to local Himba people, who speak Otjiherero. Marienflüss Conservancy now provides an institutional framework for the campsite.

Khowarib Restcamp and the Anmire Traditional Village both lie in the Anabeb Conservancy, not far from the settlement at Khowarib. People at Khowarib speak Damara or Otjiherero, or both.

Khowarib Restcamp lies on low cliffs above the Hoanib River, with spectacular views of the perennial streams and the cliffs upriver. Several outside organisations were involved in its development. Its ownership and status have been hotly contested, and the management has changed several times. The campsite is just functional. Half-completed and poorly designed infrastructure reflects the shifts in its management and in outside interventions.

Anmire Traditional Village was the private initiative of one of the women of Khowarib. She consulted thoroughly before she started, and with outside support the village ran well for a time, until collapse started to set in. Despite several attempts by IRDNC to resuscitate the enterprise, including providing management support, the ‘owner’ was not able to run the business profitably (M. Jacobsohn, pers. comm.). The buildings were in disrepair at the time of the study.

Ugab Wilderness Camp lies near the Brandberg Mountain. Tourism attractions to the area include the Brandberg and the ‘White Lady’. It also has a history of conflict over ownership, now hopefully resolved by the formation of Tsiseb Conservancy and agreements about how the campsite will operate. People speak Damara.
Appendix 2: Methods Using in Workshops

With small adaptations, the facilitation framework for the five workshops included similar steps, described below.

Getting started
Facilitators introduced themselves, explained the purpose and task of the workshop, its context and how the information would be used. “This workshop is part of a bigger study of community-owned businesses. We have done work at three campsites in Caprivi, one craft project and one traditional village. We plan to study five workshops in Kunene. We want to look at the history of your enterprise, to focus on the past, what helped it to develop and what held it back, and good and bad things that came out of it. This workshop is not about the future – it is not a planning exercise. We want to learn lessons from the past of these community-owned businesses that we can share with other people. We will produce a report like the Caprivi workshop report and send it back to you…”

Participants introduced themselves, sometimes using a symbol to show their role in the development of the enterprise. In the Khowarib and Ugab workshops, people introduced themselves as interest groups rather than as individuals.

History of the enterprise – time line
To check participants’ understanding of key events in the development of the enterprise and to provide a framework for the next exercise, facilitator and participants prepared a time line to show the development of the enterprise, recording dates and key events on cards. “Start from the time someone first had the idea... up until now.”

What helped or held back the development of the enterprise? (“Helps” and “hinders”)
To draw out participants’ understanding of the key internal and external factors that had affected the development of the enterprise, participants used the time line to remind themselves of what happened in the development of the enterprise and reflected on the questions:
- What helped the development of the enterprise?
- What held back or hindered the development of the enterprise – what did you struggle with or find difficult?
The results were recorded on cards.

Costs and benefits of the enterprise
To draw out participants’ understanding of costs and benefits of the enterprise, they reflected in groups either on good things that had come out of the enterprise for themselves, their family or other members of their community (benefits), or on things they had given up or put in to the enterprise (costs). To get to both tangible and intangible costs and benefits, they reflected “not only on things that you can see and touch, but also things of the head and heart”. What came out of small group work was shared in a role play and subsequent discussion.

In some workshops the role play turned into a celebration. In these cases, the facilitator unpacked the benefits during discussion.
The success and ownership questions
At an appropriate point in discussion facilitators asked participants to reflect on the following questions:

- Would you say that enterprise is a success or a failure? on the road to success? on the road to failure? Why?
- Who owns the enterprise? Why?

Closing off and next steps
The facilitator explained next steps in reporting back and getting photographs and information to people.
### APPENDIX 4: SUMMARY OF THE VARIOUS MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR COT ENTERPRISES AS IDENTIFIED BY SUPPORT ORGANISATIONS (FROM HALSTEAD AND MURPHY 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

26 Many of the advantages and disadvantages have been raised from community workshops and not from previous experience of the different management options at enterprises.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Private sector/lodge agreement for management oversight – fee or %</th>
<th>Same as point 4. Income reduction not as large. Familiarity with regulations of the area. Known company/person.</th>
<th>Community conflict. Perceived loss of empowerment, pride and ownership. Possible income reduction to the conservancy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Enterprise management company – fee or %</td>
<td>Same as point 5. One company may manage more than one enterprise therefore reducing the costs to conservancies.</td>
<td>Same as point 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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